

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Fields et al, with claims 5-7 (presumably 5-9 intended) being rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields in view of Vercellotti, for the reasons of record. It was suggested in the Action that Fields shows all of the elements of independent claim 1 and that with respect to independent claim 6 while Fields lacks the seal of the lamp vessel, this deficiency is overcome by Vercelotti, wherein a seal of the lamp vessel is disclosed.

In response to the foregoing rejections, independent claims 1 and 6 are herewith amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are now clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art for the reasons detailed below.

Specifically, with reference to Fields, the primary reference, what is disclosed in the cited Figure 1 and associated description is, in relevant part, a current conductor 34, 52 wherein the conductor portion 52 is bent around at least a portion of the outer transverse wall 38. However, a careful examination of Fig. 1 will reveal that the structure shown requires a metallic eyelet 42, and

that the conductor 52 which is bent around a portion of the outer transverse wall 38 is in fact spaced apart from the outer transverse wall.

In the instant invention as now more precisely claimed, on the contrary, the conductor is bent around and is in direct contact with at least a portion of the outer transverse wall.

Additionally, it is noted that by providing eyelets or bushings (42) the Fields construction is subject to the express disadvantages of such a configuration as detailed on page 1 of the instant specification. In contrast, the configuration of the instant invention, as now more precisely claimed, utilizes a substantially different structure which overcomes the more complicated configuration of prior art structures such as Fields which require eyelets or bushings, with the inherent disadvantages as described in the instant specification.

With regard to independent claim 6, this claim has also been amended in like manner to claim 1 to clearly distinguish over Fields, and the additional citation of Vercelotti to provide a teaching with regard to the seal of the lamp vessel does not overcome the fundamental deficiency of the primary reference.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are now clearly patentably

distinguishable over the cited and applied art. Accordingly, allowance of the instant application is respectfully submitted to be justified at the present time, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531
Attorney
(914) 333-9630